

## REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klebanov, U.S. Patent No. 6,397,327, in view of Motoyama, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,631,247. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 5).

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

Klebanov discloses an apparatus for configuring a computer system. During startup, a computer system attempts to access a video graphics adapter (VGA). When such a device is located, information about the device is added to the configuration, or registry file of the computer system. (Klebanov, col. 2, lines 20-31). The information about the device is of the type of information that will allow the computer system to identify the VGA as a specific product from a particular manufacturer. (Klebanov, col. 2, line 62 – col. 3, line 6). The registry is a configuration file associated with the computer system identifying the hardware present in the system. Alternatively, the configuration file, or registry, can actually be registers or hardware within the computer which contain variable values indicating the presence of such hardware. (Klebanov, col. 4, lines 48-56).

Klebanov does not disclose capturing for copying to an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices. Neither the registry nor the configuration file disclosed in Klebanov is an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices.

As disclosed by Klebanov, the configuration file is associated with a computer for identifying hardware present on the computer and includes only information necessary to allow the computer to identify the device. Klebanov does not disclose either a configuration file or a registry that includes page processing usage data for the devices. This interpretation of Klebanov is consistent with the well known use of registries and configuration files which do

not include page processing usage data for devices. Therefore, Klebanov does not disclose or suggest capturing for copying to an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices, page processing usage data, the page processing usage data captured from the discovered fleet device, the page processing usage data indicative of the number of pages processed by the device.

Additionally, Motoyama discloses a method and system for remote diagnostic, control, and information collection based on various communication modes for sending messages to a resource manager. Information is sent from a machine to a resource administrator or resource administration station. Motoyama does not disclose capturing for copying to an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices.

Neither the resource administrator nor the resource administration station disclosed in Motoyama is an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices. Therefore, Motoyama also does not disclose or suggest capturing for copying to an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices, page processing usage data, the page processing usage data captured from the discovered fleet device, the page processing usage data indicative of the number of pages processed by the device.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as amended, include wording that page processing usage data is captured for copying to an index of fleet devices and page processing usage data for the devices. The page processing usage data is captured from the discovered fleet device and indicative of the number of pages processed by the device. Neither Klebanov nor Motoyama discloses or suggests these limitations.

In view of Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan M. Janz  
Donald J. Gathman and  
Burton H. Poppenga

By   
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 06/01/2005  
(719) 260-7900